

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
14 October 1970

I. CONVENE, 708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office at 708 Jackson Place on October 14, 1970.

Present were:

William Walton, Chairman
Gordon Bunshaft
Kevin Roche
Hideo Sasaki
Chloethiel Woodard Smith
John Walker

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Sec.
Mary Bean
Sibley Jennings
Marylyn Shaw

II. ADMINISTRATION

- A. Date of next meeting was tentatively set for December 2, 1970.
- B. The minutes of the previous meeting held on July 8, 1970 were approved.

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

- A. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service
Revised Designs for the Federal Triangle, Post Office
Department, Old Post Office Tower and Great Plaza.
Vincent Kling and Associates, architects.

The members had agreed previously that the completion of the Triangle should be a restoration of the original scheme and that the continued use of the original architectural style was appropriate. The plan for three distinct sections of the Triangle were approved: First, the completion of the Internal Revenue Service Building by a plan which eliminated the bulk of the old Post Office but retained the tower; second, the completion of the Post Office Department; and third, the completion of the Great Plaza with landscaping and an underground parking garage.

Because official agencies and public sentiment had so forcefully favored the retention of the old Post Office tower, the Commission reversed its original position against the retention

of the tower and gave its approval to this plan for the completion of the Internal Revenue Service Building. Since the previous submission of the plans for the Great Plaza had been altered and the changes were considered an improvement. The green areas were enlarged, the pool divided into two sections, and a sunken courtyard developed around the perimeter of the plaza so that the courtyard opened into the first level of the two-level underground garage and communicated with the subway concourse.

B. Department of the Army, Chief of Engineers

Proposed Design for new Walter Reed Army Hospital.
Stone, Marraccini, and Patterson, architects.

A hospital to replace all temporary buildings on the Walter Reed Hospital grounds was submitted. Two levels of underground parking will provide parking space for 1000 cars. The first three floors house administrative services. The fourth floor, cantilevered over the portico on the first floor, houses surgery facilities and intensive care units. On the remaining floors, which project further over the lower floors, technical facilities are located in the center, surrounded by an interior courtyard and joined by a hallway in each corner to a ring of nursing facilities lining the outside wall of the building. Between each 9' high floor used for hospital facilities is another 9' high floor housing mechanical services.

The members thought that the organization and planning of the hospital was an exceptionally good solution to a complex planning problem, but that the exterior lacked good proportion and distinction. They discussed the possibility of making the fourth floor equal in size to the upper floors so that the building would appear as two simple volumes rather than a series of projections. The use of steel on the exterior, exposing the mechanical floors on the outside, was favored over the precast concrete panels which were submitted for the exterior.

C. D.C. Government, Office of General Services

1. Proposed Design for Benning Elementary School, 41st & East Capitol Streets, N.E. Berla, Abel, and Weinstein, architects.

The members thought that the design, which involved a 31' cut into the side of the hill, was poorly adapted to the hillside site. They generally agreed that the design lacked character and that the plan was ill-conceived. In fact, it was observed that the entire project appeared to have been given little study and the effort by the architect appeared to be minimal. The presentation was of unusually poor quality.

2. Revised Design for Gage Eckington School, 2nd and V Streets, N.W. Lindsey and Associates, architects.

Since the design was first submitted at the July meeting, the architects had revised it along the lines suggested by the Commission. The cafeteria, auditorium, and office on the ground floor adjacent to the well had been restudied, resulting in a simplification of the plan and exterior elevation. The members approved the submission and considered an interview with the architect unnecessary.

3. Proposed Design for Merritt Elementary School, 49th & Hayes Streets, N.E. Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon architects.

The design, which exploited the site by stepping up the hillside, utilized a two-story split floor system, resulting in four distinct level changes. The interior spaces were flexible enough to be used in many ways. Future expansion would be horizontal rather than vertical so that classes would not be disrupted while building was progressing. Forms, massing and architectural treatment in general were obviously given a great deal of thought and study for maximum effect. The reaction of the members was very favorable toward the design.

D. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

1. Proposed Rehabilitation of Memorial Bridge Statues, Leo Friedlander, sculptor.

The Secretary explained that the sculptor's son has urged that the National Park Service repair and refinish them with bronze which has been treated to resist weathering processes. While the members favored the repair of the statues, they disapproved the proposal to use non-weathering bronze as a finish. They made three recommendations: first, that the gold leaf which presently covers the statues be removed and replaced with a bronze finish; that nothing be used which inhibits the natural weathering of the metal; and that a sample of the treatment of the patina be submitted. Exhibit A.

2. Relocation of Statue of Jose de San Martin at 20th Street and Virginia Avenue, N.W.

Both the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Park Service approved the location of the statue on the corner of the triangular lot, a site which will later be developed as a park. Mr. Walton explained that the location had been selected in an effort to relate the San Martin statue to a statue to be placed in the proposed Walt Whitman park west of Rawling Park.

The members felt that the location of the statue in this lot was acceptable, but that the statue should not be permanently located before a plan is developed for the entire park.

3. Proposed Repainting of the Netherlands Carillon

Superintendent Floyd Taylor had informally asked the Secretary to review a sample of gray paint which had been proposed for painting the carillon, and the Secretary suggested that the paint sample be submitted to the members for their recommendation. They suggested that the carillon, which is now painted olive drab, be painted black. Exhibit B.

4. Presidents Cabinet Committee on Education

F. D.C. Government, Office of Economic Development, Shipstead-Luce Act.

1. S.L. 71-11, 1701 New York Avenue, N.W. Proposed Design for Office Building. Vlastimil Koubek, architect.

The Secretary explained that an attempt to coordinate the planning of the entire block had failed due to lack of interest on the part of other property owners. The members were displeased by the disparity between the floor levels of this proposed building and those of the design for the American Institute of Architects which is adjacent to it. The level of the floors was determined by the height limitations in the area and the desire of the client to extract from the site the maximum rentable space. In light of these factors the members, with some reluctance, approved the design of the building subject to the submission of the material samples.

2. S.L. 71-10, 601 D Street, N.W. Proposed Design for Office Building. Rocco Tricarico, architect.

Although lacking in distinction, the building was not offensive and agreed with the land use plans developed by the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission and with downtown urban renewal plans. Located two blocks west of Judiciary Square, it will be in a block presently planned to be devoted to commercial office buildings. The members had no objection to the building.

3. S.L. 71- , Columbia Plaza Office Building, 24th and F Streets, N.W. Revised Design. Cosgrove and Associates, architects.

While the Commission had previously approved the building's location, massing and connections with the other areas of the development, it did not approve this submission because of the obvious discrepancy in scale and detailing between the office building and the surrounding apartment houses. They suggested a complete restudy of the exterior treatment, particularly the fenestration.

- Unions*
4. S.L. 71-12, United States Office Building, 17th and New York Avenue, N.W. Approval of working drawings. Cosgrove and Associates, architects.

The architects had asked for specific approval of the set of working drawings for the building. The Secretary explained that he had examined the drawings and had found no discrepancies between them and the approved submission for the building. He recommended their approval, and the members gave theirs.

5. Report of the Department of the Interior on the Proposed Legislation to Erect a Statue to Bernardo de Galvez.

The members approved the report of the Department of Interior which reaffirmed the Committee's recommendation that the legislation not be passed.

6. Appendix 1. Exhibit C.

IV. INTERVIEWS

- A. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Relocation of Statue of Jose de San Martin.

Present were Mr. Vasqueth from the Argentine government, Mr. White from the State Department, and Mr. Rowell from National Park Service.

The members reiterated their opinion that the location of the statue in this piece of land was acceptable, but that the statue should not be permanently erected until a complete plan for the site has been developed. Exhibit D.

- B. General Services Administration. Revised Design for Federal Triangle.

Present were Mr. Kling from the architect's office and Mr. Hand from G.S.A.

While the members approved the submission, they had two suggestions which were expressed to the architect by Mr. Sasaki. Concerned about the size of the trees in the Great Plaza, the Commission suggested that very large shade trees be used. They were also concerned that the circular traffic pattern between the hemicycles on 12th Street would generate numerous temporary traffic signs.

Mr. Kling replied that he had not yet chosen a type of tree and would give the matter consideration. He also said that the Traffic Department had not yet been approached in regard to the street circulation on 12th Street. Exhibit E.

C. D.C. Government Office of General Services.
Benning Elementary School.

Mr. Rohr from the D.C. School District and Mr. Abel and Mr. Weinstein were present.

Mrs. Smith stated the Commission's objections to the weakness of the design and its lack of unity and organization. Because Mrs. Smith implied that a design should be developed which used less land, Mr. Bunshaft explicitly pointed out that land use was not a problem and that the entire design needed restudy. In response to Mr. Sasaki's question about whether or not the roofs could be used, Mr. Abel replied that the school authorities had ruled out this possibility. Exhibit F.

D. Department of the Army, Chief of Engineers.
New Walter Reed Army Hospital Building.

Mr. Patterson and Mr. Pflueger from the architect's office, as well as representatives of the Army, were present.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Roche expressed the members' enthusiastic endorsement of the site planning and the organization of the complex medical center. He pointed out that the members believed that the steel structure of the building should be exposed on the outside and not hidden by precast concrete panels, and that the mechanical floors could be revealed through windows. He asked if the fourth floor could be extended out to the edge of the upper mass to eliminate the step-like projections. The architect replied that the programmatic and budgetary requirements would probably preclude that possibility. Exhibit G.

A copy of the transcript is attached. Exhibit H.

E. Columbia Plaza Office Building, S.L. 71- .

Mr. Cosgrove represented the architects.

Mr. Bunshaft expressed the Commission's disapproval of the scale of the fenestration and suggested a complete restudy of the design. Exhibit I.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Submitted by

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

9 November 1970

Dear Mr. Dickenson:

At its meeting on the 14th of October, the Commission of Fine Arts considered the rehabilitation of the Friedlander statues, "Valor" and "Sacrifice", on the end of Memorial Bridge.

The Commission has no objection to the removal of the gold finish on these two groups. However, if the finish can be restored to the natural bronze we would not like it treated with a weather resistant finish that would prevent it from turning green and black in the traditional way. Of course we would like to see a sample of the patina before going ahead with the work of cleaning the entire surfaces. As you know, the finish on the two Frazier statues at the entrance to Rock Creek Park is in even worse condition and it would probably make sense to refinish all four at the same time in order to give a uniformity of appearance around the Lincoln Memorial.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Russell E. Dickenson
General Superintendent
National Park Service, National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit A.

12 November 1970

Dear Mr. Dickenson:

Some weeks ago Mr. Floyd Taylor asked me to come over and look at samples of the paint that is to be used on the Netherlands Carillon. I told him at the time that he might as well go ahead with one of the colors as a primer but that I would like to talk to the Commission before any formal action.

Since that time I have had a chance to bring up this matter at our meeting on the 14th of October and it was the unanimous feeling that the tower should be painted a flat black. The gray paint makes it look too much like stone which it isn't. And the black would make it blend into the hillside more than it presently does. We should also point out that a light color such as a gray that is presently proposed will immediately pick up any rusting and will, of course, prominently show the stain. Black, of course, will not.

Please give me a call if you have any questions about this. I would be happy to meet with you or representatives of the Dutch Embassy in case they would like to have our views more fully explained.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Russell E. Dickenson
National Capital Parks, National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B.

October 14, 1970			REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS
NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT	
SL 70-42	2500 Virginia Ave., NW Watergate	Resubmission of enclosure	
ACTION: Disapproved. See action on SL 70-41. 7/10/70			
43	2400 Virginia Ave., N.W. Columbia Plaza	Plastic illuminated sign free standing double faced on private property.	
ACTION: Withdrawn			
44	2400 Virginia Ave., N.W. Columbia Plaza	Plastic illuminated sign free standing double faced on private property	
ACTION: Withdrawn			
45	1452 N.Y. Ave., N.W. Interstate Bldg. & Loan	Install one single faced sign duranodic background metal to match metal on front of bldg. w/white plastic cut out letters as per sketch, no illumination whatsoever. Existing letters to be removed due to vandalizing.	
ACTION: Approved, 7/8/70			
71-1	1327 1/2 E St., N.W. Serenade Record Shop	Install 1 single faced plastic sign, backlighted as per plan. Gray background, white ltr, white tubing concealed. Overall size of sign 3'x8'.	
ACTION: Approved. 7/16/70			
2	165 D St., S.E. Violet Lowens	Construct porch at rear of house, convert to bathroom. Add new stair fr grads to 2nd flr. Add new stair from 2nd to 3rd flr & enclose. Add new closets and cabinets on 3d flr.	
ACTION: Approved. 7/6/70			
3	1732 Portal Dr., N.W. Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Canaday	Rear addn of family room to exist. dwelling.	
ACTION: Approved. 7/16/70			

Exhibit C.

APPENDIX 1

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
70-162	1522 Wisconsin Ave, NW A.L. Wheeler	Add awning as shown on plans. Roll up awning, back vinyl, projection to be determined on site (not to touch existing tree)
ACTION: No objection as revised. 7/14/70		
70-163	1440 Wisconsin Ave, NW Melart Jewelers	Furnish and install 1 complete regular shape pull up style store front awning.
ACTION: No objection - in keeping with premises. 7/14/70		
71-1	1689 34th St., NW Mrs. Wenzella W. Ripley	Alter existing garage and add one story for recreation room and bathroom per plans.
ACTION: Recommended. 7/14/70		
2	3059 M St., NW Sam Levy	A sign to read Fendrick Gallery, to cover 18 1/2 sq. ft., to be flat against bldg. restriction line; 14' above the sidewalk, and 2' above the existing projection.
ACTION: No objection for letters pin mounted or flat against bldg. 7/14/70.		
3	3015 Que St., NW Joseph Passonneau	Addn of condensor/compression unit on flat roof extension (kitchen) at rear of property.
ACTION: No objection. 7/10/70		
4	3077 M St., NW Harry & Melvin Greenburg	Replace wood porch & steps w/new steel steps, platform rails and columns, same size. No roof.
ACTION: Recommended. 7/16/70		
5	1245 34th St., NW Mrs. J.C. Bohlenbacher	Aluminum siding on front & south side walls. Cover window sills only. No covering of window trim.
ACTION: Recommended per revised samples submitted for review at July 8 mtg. 7/16/70		
6	1648 33rd St., NW Mike Zimmerman	Remove old exist. porch and porch roof; install brick steps & 6'x6' brick stoop w/wrought iron railing around stoop & down steps; bury oil tank under front yard; instl 3 sets of shutters; repair brick & paint.
ACTION: Ret. for correct, measured dwgs showing proposed windows. Recm 6/6 or 4/4 lights, whichever is higher than		

wide and well proportioned. 7/27/70

7 3013 Cambridge Pl, NW
Stephen B. Newman
ACTION: Recommended. 9/9/70

To construct garage in existing basement & driveway as per plans.

8 3110 M St., NW
Canal Square Associates
ACTION: Recommended. 8/21/70

Decorative improvements to existing retail shop.

9 1226 Wisconsin Ave., NW
Marriott Corp.
ACTION: Ret. for a dwg indicating location of lights. 8/19/70.

Install continuous row of fixtures outside core of projection and 2 lites on top of show window proj.

10 3108 M St., NW
The Designers
Action: Recommended. 9/9/70

Sign. Aluminum letters flat against wall.

12 3027 M St., NW
Junior League Shop
ACTION: Recommended. 9/9/70.

Sign. Attach raised black ltrs to white panel.

13 1007 Thomas Jefferson Pl, NW
Mr. & Mrs. John F. Barnard
ACTION: Recommended. 9/9/70

Raze existing two story brick structure.

14 1048 29th St., N.W.
jEmil Rykoskey

Remodel windows on front of bldg.

ACTION: Not recommended. Proposed changes inappropriate. Recommend retention of existing sash. 10/7/70.

15. 1068 31st St., N.W.
Brian G. Wallace

Remove double hung sash and install 1 light of 1/4" polished plate glass to form a show window (no projections). Glass to be installed so as not to preclude the reinstallation of the double hung sash. No structural change to building.

ACTION: Not recommended. Proposed change out of scale and character with existing building. 10/7/70.

16 1068 31st St., N.W.
Brian G. Wallace

Install a surface mounted sign in accordance with dwg

ACTION: Not recommended. Sign out of character with existing building. Suggest double faced wood painted sign supported by brack et and mounted on building. Letters to be in classical style.

17

3239 M St., N.W.

Potomack Restaurant

ACTION: Recommended. 10/7/70

Supply and install signs.

18

1039 31st St., N.W.

Mr. Culver

ACTION: Not recommended. Recommend restudy of design with particular attention to character, scale and relationship of openings on front elevation. 10/7/70.

Alteration and repair to commercial bldg.

19

1643 Wisconsin Ave., N.W.

Elias Namerdy

ACTION: Not recommended. Character of proposed changes inappropriate. Recommend retention of existing bay and windows. 10/7/70.

Renovation of existing storefront.

20

1200 Wisconsin Ave., N.W.

National Bank of Washington

ACTION: Not recommended. No objection to new sash on 2nd and 3rd floors but character of remaining changes inappropriate. 10/7/70

Refacing of an existing building.

21

1226 Wisconsin Ave., N.W.

Marriott Corp.

Install continuous row of fixtures outside core of projection and 2 lites on top of show window projection.

ACTION: Not recommended. Proposed lighting would only emphasize what is already an unattractive building. 10/7/70

9 November 1970

Dear Mr. Dickenson:

At its meeting on the 14th of October, the Commission considered the location of the statue of Jose San Martin on the site at 20th Street and Virginia Avenue, N.W.

The Commission cannot approve the proposed location until such time as a plan for the entire site has been developed. This is a large and important park and its relation to the view of the Washington Monument along Virginia Avenue makes it even more significant.

The Commission's next meeting is scheduled for the 2nd of December and we will be happy to inspect any plans at that time.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Russell E. Dickenson
General Superintendent
National Park Service, National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit D.

10 November 1970

Dear Mr. Sampson:

At its meeting on October 14th, the Commission of Fine Arts considered further development of the Federal Triangle including completion of the Internal Revenue Service Building, retention of the Old Post Office Tower, extension of the Post Office Department and plans for the Great Plaza and its parking facility. All of these projects were approved unanimously by the Commission.

Plans for the Great Plaza were especially good, showing considerable improvement over the last submission. The enlarged green areas will be in keeping with the monumental scale of the Plaza but at the same time offer a welcome relief to the expanses of masonry.

In this regard the Commission would like to stress the need for large shade trees on the same scale as some of the existing trees. This factor of course will have to be taken into consideration in providing ample planting depth, etc. As far as the Old Post Office Tower is concerned, the Commission recognizes the widespread sentiment within the community, both official and otherwise to save it as a landmark in Washington. While this may not be the best architectural solution, the arguments to save it are nevertheless valid. The Commission feels that the architect has handled the solution quite well. Some details at the base of the tower remain to be resolved but we feel that with further study the architect can satisfactorily work out the design.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. A. F. Sampson
Commissioner
Public Buildings Service
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit E.

9 November 1970

Dear Colonel Starobin:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered the designs for three elementary schools at its meeting on the 14th of October.

The Commission disapproved plans for the Benning Elementary School at 41st and East Capitol Streets, N.W. While the conditions on the site admittedly are difficult, there appeared to be insufficient imagination in adapting the design to the conditions. The plan was poorly organized, the massing was complex and the scheme required cuts up to 30 feet deep in the side of the hill. The Commission would like to see a fresh approach to the design.

The plans for the Gage Eckington School at 2nd and P Sts., N.W. and the Merritt School at 49th and Hayes St., N.E. were approved.

The revisions to the Eckington School design were along lines suggested at our 8 July meeting and considerably improved the design.

The Merritt Elementary School is an excellent solution and with a program and site nearly identical to the Benning Elementary School it clearly illustrates what can be achieved by careful study and effort on the part of the architect.

We will be meeting again on the 2nd of December and would be glad to look at studies for the Benning School at that time.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Lt. Colonel Sam D. Starobin
Acting Director
Department of General Services
Room 501
601 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit F.

12 November 1970

Dear Colonel Love:

At its meeting on the 14th of October the Commission of Fine Arts considered the designs for the new Walter Reed Army Hospital building. The architects have done an excellent job in organizing a highly complex program in a simple and powerful plan.

The Architectural treatment unfortunately is not consistently strong. For example, there appeared to be little effort in taking advantage of the unique arrangements of alternating mechanical floors in the expression of the facade. Also the precast concrete elements attached to the steel structural frame seem arbitrary and again inconsistent. With the entire structure of the building designed in steel why wouldn't it be more consistent to carry this same material to the exterior? The Commission feels it would be far preferable and could result in a design of great distinction. The architects indicated they would make additional studies and we will be glad to view these at a future meeting.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Colonel W. J. Love
District Engineer
Corps of Engineers
Baltimore District
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Exhibit G.

sections and looked at the need for having some protection, solar protection, the creation of the setback --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Excuse me. I don't think that would give you any protection, two or three feet.

MR. PATTERSON: Only to a degree.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It is something you tell a class, not another architect.

MR. PATTERSON: The point I wanted to identify: there is enough protection here to enable the consideration of soffit ventilating to the inner floor space. That was the only point I was getting to.

I agree this cannot be identified as an adequate protection. We are intending to use solar tinted glass, in fact a tinted mirror glass here.

I think one of you mentioned this in your comments.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think between that air thing and all that you could really get an interesting thing.

MR. ROCHE: You have a really great opportunity to make possibly the best building in Washington, because it is all there if you can just go the next step with it. It is well worth a try.

The other part about getting an expression of this thing, that steel expresses the special nature of this building, that we are quite safe about.

MR. PFLUEGER: Without question I think we will go into it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We don't expect you to arrive at the final answer this minute. We are just stating our position, knowing in what respects we are happy with it and in what respects we are unhappy.

I can tell that you do understand what we are talking about.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes; I do.

May I mention one thing: I guess as we hear ideas from others it brings across an association of an earlier consideration. That had to do with the recognition that we are not dealing with a normal conventional arrangement here.

There are the inner newer spaces that you have identified. We did consider exterior treatment that would involve less fenestration for the occupied areas, less fenestration for the inner floor spaces, but as we developed

certain ones, contiguous with related nursing units. Hence we came up with the solution of the central core for clinics, separated from the nursing units by the cores, and linked together by the ridges.

In short, I am saying that it is quite a fixed set of conditions.

In respect to the concern --and we have shared this from the beginning of design, that is the relationship of the upper block to the lower block -- it seems to us that this is most evident on this south court that is looking at the building from building one where the lower floors have come into the total picture.

Actually it does not, as I am certain that you have observed, have the same impact at the front here due to the mall coming out over the garage.

So we are really looking at only one elevation where this relationship or proportion occurs.

MR. BUNSHAFT: As I said, that is a suggestion, because you know one can't sit here and say, "Well, add 40,000 square feet just for the hell of it." That is only a suggestion.

given area, and a given kind of organizational arrangement for allof the functions that had to go on that floor, that fortunately enabled us to integrate it with our structural columns here.

Another aspect that we were concerned about was trying to avoid any sheer, block walls all the way down, and we do not have this kind of situation.

But again on the second and third floors the functional requirements there, and the areas of the particular components on that floor, enable us to confine those in the same perimeter on that particular level.

The first floor below being partially in the ground, there is no opportunity for varying that perimeter.

Maybe I am being too quick in my response here. I cannot imagine a way that we could extend this fourth floor out to this particular perimeter -- or vice versa, to condense this perimeter in to meet the other, to meet the requirements on the nursing floor.

I think the most important program requirement for this building was the using agency's request -- and I think a practical one -- to place critical facilities,

in height than the upper thing.

But, of course, that involves a lot of square feet.

MR. PATTERSON: I would like to respond to that because it is such a pertinent point that both of you gentlemen have touched on.

We have been aware from the beginning of designing if we were starting out to arbitrarily design the most handsome proportions of two elements we might very well have chosen a block with four floors on top to change the proportions.

But we are faced, I think, with the unchangeable problem of meeting area requirements and budgetary requirements, and the particular solution here that developed was certainly in response to the very critical functional requirements of all of these complex floors.

We felt somewhat happy that we were at least able to get an organization of these lower four floors that tied in with the structure.

If I might just move over here, I think right here the planning requirements on this fourth floor gave us a

nice building that any of us would have done that didn't have 18 feet or didn't have this mechanical floor.

What we are trying to do is get more juice for you in this project to make it a fabulous one instead of just a good one.

As far as color, we are all guilty of dark windows and light precast or travertine or something. Here you have a chance with a very unusual thing with this mechanical space. It might be interesting to show it.

The other thing I would like to emphasize is the proportion of it. When you are up here looking at the meadow, it is all good; it looks very nice, but when you see the elevation, it is a very unpleasant proportion between the upper half and the lower half.

It is not very easy to do, but I understand that the floor right below those three floors is the surgical space. Can that be let out to the line above? That is adding a lot of square feet, but it would give you much better proportion.

It seems to us if you had four floors as a mass that would be even more powerful, with a base that is smaller

You have a very fine piece of architecture.

MR. PATTERSON: I certainly feel respectful to this analysis, and I am sure it would require our time and study to respond more meaningfully to this proposal.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I would like to clarify in my mind: what Kevin is talking about here, you have this truss; you have this whole mechanical floor. It is a unique opportunity to make a building that is unique, not to make it look like another building.

I think the big, bold simple thing is absolutely marvelous, and it might be that if you look at that model, you have red brick buildings and so forth, it might possibly be a tinted steel or black steel, and the whole thing would have none of this heaviness at all.

There would be no harm in having glass in this mechanical space where people are doing work from time to time, and there is no great heat loss problem or anything of that nature.

You could have a unique design that expressed the unique section and plans.

I think, to put it bluntly: this looks like a

by doing this in the manner that does express structural trusses, but again this might be hanging on hopefully to the particular material type used here, though certainly we ought to look at any alternatives.

MR. ROCHE: I think our criticism has more to do than just the use of the material.

You have a very large building here, enormous scale. The fact that you have double floors makes it even larger scale. The fact you use concrete in such a gross way makes the scale even larger.

I don't necessarily vote that as a criticism, but that is really what it is. So you have a buildup of elements here which tend to make this building even larger, even stronger, even more to scale in relation to the surrounding buildings, than it would be dealt with in another way, to say nothing at all about the directness of the thing as a building.

I think you would have a much finer building if you dealt with the problems more directly, and it would stand on its own. You wouldn't need to worry about relationships with other buildings.

architectural expression, we would like to see either a steel system expression of the trusses or something of that nature.

We recognize, of course, it has to be a fireproof structure, but there are other ways to do it than this fairly arbitrary form of the precast concrete which you have, which doesn't really relate to any of the hard nuts things that you have inside.

MR. PATTERSON: Perhaps I have a couple of remarks to gain understanding here, and I think your last comment has made it clear, namely: the interest in seeing if there are other materials that would more suitably express the planning concept here.

Partly we were considering precast concrete here in respect to the materials used on other buildings on the site, endeavoring not to match existing facilities, but to give some identification to the other buildings.

I think the point you have judged on here relative to the expression of trusses may be definitely one that could be responded to. I would wonder whether there might be a more satisfactory answer and responses to your point

appreciation of the technical aspect of the building that you had when you did your planning.

By this I mean to say it is a steel structure, it is a long span steel structure, and yet when you come to showing the outside of it, you hang all the reinforced concrete, all the precast concrete on the outside.

There was the feeling that if you could be more direct with the outside of this thing, if you could express more directly what you have inside in this otherwise splendid building, this building could be projected from a good building to being a really superb one.

We felt the opportunity was there to do, and we would like to see you really do that. I think this is where we left it.

There was also some question about the proportions of the upper mass to the lower mass. We wondered if it wouldn't be possible to carry this lower mass out here so that the lower section would be simpler and more direct, and wouldn't have the complication which this recess has at the moment.

But I think specifically in terms of the

We look forward to seeing you again.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

NEW WALKER ROAD ARMY HOSPITAL BUILDING

(Members Patterson, Pfeleger and others entered the conference room)

CHAIRMAN LAMSON: The Commission is happy, impressed with the concept of this. We have asked Mr. to speak for us and ask some questions, and perhaps also suggestions.

MR. ROCHER: There is a great deal of enthusiasm for this project in terms of the plan which is obviously very advanced and very excellent, very well laid out, and undoubtedly a superior facility.

The site plan was similarly treated as a solution to a difficult problem.

We had some questions about the visual architecture, but, having once agreed that the plan is ideal and serves the purpose and is, in fact, probably quite a remarkable achievement, in view of the difficulties you were dealing with, we wish that you had continued in the architecture of the thing, the expression of it, with the same directness and

MR. BUNSHAFT: In fact, that louvered thing you were talking about in this nine feet of mechanical space - have just some at the top and bottom, all the way around, might do the same thing. It might lead to a more interesting treatment of the whole facade. It might even cost less.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We thank you very much.

MR. PATTERSON: We appreciate your comments.

S. L. 71 COLUMBIA PLAZA OFFICE BUILDING

(Mr. Cosgrove entered the conference room)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Commission has ordered to reject the building, and we have asked Mr. Bunshaft to explain our position.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The massing we approved once before, and that is still approved.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That stands.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But the pattern of the fenestration, both on the upper mass and lower mass has no relation to office buildings or this project at all. In fact, it seems to us rather strange that you could get a more domestic scale in this office building than they have in the housing.

It is totally sort of superficial decoration, and we don't like it. Really there is a bigger scale.

9 November 1970

Dear Mister Mister:

At its meeting on the 14th of October the Commission of Fine Arts considered elevations for the new office building in the Columbia Plaza project at 24th and E Streets, N.W.

The Commission disapproved the design which in its opinion was badly out of scale with adjacent buildings and was otherwise not in character. We have asked the architect to restudy facades and submit them for our next meeting which is scheduled for 2 December 1970.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Melvin A. Mister
Executive Director
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit I.

18 November 1970

Dear Mr. May:

This will confirm my previous letter giving the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts of the proposed seal for the Cabinet Committee on Education.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Alan May
The President's Cabinet Committee
on Education
Washington, D.C.

18 November 1970

Dear Mr. May:

This will confirm my previous letter giving the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts of the proposed seal for the Cabinet Committee on Education.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Alan May
The President's Cabinet Committee
on Education
Washington, D.C.

